

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/500,454	02/08/2005	Monique Berwaer	2004_0980A	2004_0980A 2307	
513 7	590 06/26/2006		EXAMINER		
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 2033 K STREET N. W.			SILVERMAN, ERIC E		
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1615		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/500,454	BERWAER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Eric E. Silverman, PhD	1615		

	Eric E. Silverman, PhD	1615	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	lress
THE REPLY FILED 16 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final reject	ion.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount chortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Off	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a one of the NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			uie issues ioi
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		•	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		Il be entered and an	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidate	otice of Appeal will <u>ne</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	hed.
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	No(s)	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. In response to the argument that efletirizine would not be chosen by the artisan from among the drugs taught therein, it is noted that efletirizine is a claimed embodiment of Kreutmer (claim 4). With response to the argument that efletirizine is not a "long acting" drug, it is noted that the release profile of a drug depends not only on the drug itself, but on the overall formulation of the dosage form in which the drug is included. As such, this general statement is not well understood, and no evidence to support this allegation has been provided. In repsonse to Applicants' argument regarding claim 6, wherein Applicant contends that the motivation to combine the teaching of Guy with the teaching of Kreutner is not clear, it is believed that the motivation to do so was clearly communicated in the Office Action mailed 9-1-2005. However, to further clarify, Guy is related to a tablet that offers a specific type of release profile, and several advantages relating to the use of these release profile are taught. Kreutner teaches drugs, such as eflitirizine, that are known for use in treating specific types of conditions. Thus, the artisan practicing the invention of Guy who desired to treat a condition treatable by eflitirizine, according to Kreutner, would be motivated to use eflitirizine, as taught by Kreutner.

MICHAEL P. WOODWARD SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600